#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

GERALD RUHNOW; CONNIE RUHNOW,	)
Plaintiffs,	
<b>v.</b>	) CIVIL ACTION NO. CV 2:05-cv-527-F
LANE HEARD TRUCKING, LLC., et al.,	) )
Defendants.	(
NORTHLAND INSURANCE CO.,	)
Intervener,	)
v.	
LANE HEARD TRUCKING, LLC., et al.,	) ) )
Defendants.	)

# PLAINTIFFS GERALD RUHNOW AND CONNIE RUHNOW'S REQUESTED JURY CHARGES

COME NOW plaintiffs in the above-styled action and, pursuant to this Court's Scheduling Order, hereby submit the attached Jury Charges for consideration. Plaintiffs adopt and incorporate Northland Insurance Company's Requested Jury Charges 1-26, 40-44, 45(but for the last two sentences), 53-54, 56, 58 and 59. Plaintiffs have not submitted a requested Jury Verdict Form at this time, as it was counsel for plaintiffs understanding

at the Pre-Trial Conference that the Court was to consider a proper jury form during the trial of this matter.

This 12<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Callen Sparrow

J. Callen Sparrow (ASB-4515-R79J) Attorney for Plaintiffs

#### OF COUNSEL:

HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, L. L. C.

P. O. Box 11310 (35202)

2224 1st Avenue North

Birmingham, AL 35203

Phone:

(205)326-3336

Facsimile:

(205)326-3332

E-mail:

jcsparrow@hgdlawfirm.com

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on January 16, 2007, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

J. Burruss Riis, Esq.

Katie L. Hammett, Esq.

HAND ARENDALL, LLC

P. O. Box 123

Mobile, Alabama 36601

Telephone: (251)432-5511 Facsimle: (251)694-6375

E-mail: <u>khammett@handarendall.com</u> (Counsel for Lane Heard Trucking, LLC)

Richard M. Freeman, Jr., Esq.

Robert C. Ward, Esq.

RUSHTON, STAKELY, JOHNSTON

& GARRETT, P.A.

P.O. Box 270

Montgomery, Alabama 36101-0270

Telephone: 334-206-3100

Facsimile: 334-262-6277

E-mail: rmf@rsig.com

(Counsel for Christy Leann Champion)

Linda Hinson Ambrose, Esq.

ROGERS AND ASSOCIATES

3000 Riverchase Galleria, Suite 650

Birmingham, Alabama 35242

Telephone: (205)982-4620

Facsimile: (205)982-4630

E-mail:<u>lambrose@spt.com</u> lambrose@travelers.com

(Council for Northland Inquire

(Counsel for Northland Insurance Company)

Murry S. Whitt, Esq. Alex L. Holtsford, Jr. Esq. P. O. Box 4128 Montgomery, Alabama 36103-4128

Telephone: (334)215-8585 Facsimile: (334)215-7101

E-mail: aholtsford@nixholtsford.com MWhitt@nixholtsford.com

> /s/ J. Callen Sparrow Of Counsel

The plaintiffs claim the defendants were negligent in the operation of their motor vehicles and that their negligence combined and concurred to proximately cause certain injuries and damages suffered by the plaintiffs. The defendants in answer to the plaintiffs' complaint deny that they were negligent and deny that any actions by them combined and concurred to proximately cause the injuries and damages suffered by the plaintiffs.

This presents for your determination the following:

Was any defendant negligent as claimed by the plaintiffs?

If so, was such negligence of any defendant the proximate cause of any injury or damage sustained by the plaintiffs as claimed?

If you find both of the above issues in favor of the plaintiffs and against any defendant, what sum of money will fairly and reasonably compensate the plaintiffs for the injury or damage so sustained?

If either of the above elements are not proven to your reasonable satisfaction as to any defendant, then your verdict should be in favor of such defendants.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN

APJI 21.01 Plaintiff's Negligence Claim- General Denial

The plaintiffs claim the defendants wantonly operated their motor vehicles and that the defendants wantonly injured the plaintiffs, and that as a proximate consequence thereof, the plaintiffs suffered injuries and damages. The defendants deny that they acted wantonly and deny that any actions by them combined and concurred to proximately cause the injuries and damages suffered by the plaintiffs.

This presents for your determination the following:

Was any defendant guilty of wantonness as claimed by the plaintiffs?

If so, was the wantonness of any defendant the proximate cause of any injury and damage sustained by the plaintiffs?

If so, what sum of money will fairly and reasonably compensate the plaintiffs for the injury and damage so sustained, taking also into consideration the question of punitive damages as will be explained to you later?

If either of the above elements are not proven to your reasonable satisfaction as to any defendant, then the plaintiffs would not be entitled to recover against any defendant under the plaintiffs' claims based on wanton conduct.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
OTATA		WIIIDIWI WI

APJI 21.02 Plaintiffs' Wanton Claim- General Denial

Negligence means the failure to exercise reasonable care; that is, such care as a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under the same or similar circumstances.

Therefore, "negligence" is the failure to do what a reasonably prudent person would have done under the same or similar circumstances, or, the doing of something which a reasonably prudent person would not have done under the same or similar circumstances.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
O1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TEL COLD	**************************************

**APJI 28.01 Negligence and Ordinary Care** 

The negligence of two or more persons may concur and combine to
proximately cause injuries and damages. Causes "concur and combine"
when they join together to produce a given result.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN

APJI 28.04 Concurring and Combining Negligence- Definition

	such as this, all persons a sults of their negligence.	re jointly and severally liable for				
GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN				
APJI 28.08 Joint and Several Liability						

The proximate cause of an injury is that cause which in the natural
and probable sequence of events, and without the intervention of any new or
independent cause, produces the injury and without which such injury would
not have occurred.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN

**APJI 33.00 Proximate Cause- Definition** 

	If	on	e is	s gu	ilty	of	neglig	gence	which	conci	urs	or	COI	mbine	es	with
negli	gen	ce	of	ano	ther,	an	d the	two	combin	ne to	pro	duc	ce	injur	y,	each
negli	gen	t pe	erso	n is	liabl	e fo	r the 1	esulti	ng injur	y and	the	neg	glig	ence	of	each
will b	e d	een	ned	the	prox	imat	te caus	se of t	he injur	у.						

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
	·	

**APJI 33.01 Combined and Concurrent Causes** 

The disputed issues of fact to be decided by you in this case are whether the defendants negligently operated their motor vehicles and whether their negligence combined and concurred to proximately cause certain injuries and damages suffered by the plaintiffs. The burden is upon the plaintiffs to reasonably satisfy you by a preponderance of the evidence of the truthfulness of the matters and things claimed by them before the plaintiffs would be entitled to recover.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
CIVEN	VELOPED	WIITIDIXAWIN

APJI 8.00 General Denial by Defendant; Chatman v. Houston, 777 So.2d 745 (Ala. Civ. App. 2000).

If you are reasonably satisfied from the evidence in this case that all
or more than one, of the defendants were negligent and that their negligence
concurred and combined to proximately cause the injuries and damages
claimed by the plaintiffs, then each defendant found negligent is liable to the
plaintiffs.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
OLVEN	KETUSED	WIITIDIAWN

**APJI 28.05 Concurring and Combining Negligence of Defendants** 

Compensatory or actual damages are allowed and should be awarded where the plaintiffs reasonably satisfy the jury from the evidence that the plaintiffs have been injured or damaged as a proximate result of an act of negligence on the part of the defendants, or where the plaintiffs reasonably satisfy the jury from the evidence that plaintiffs have been wantonly injured by the defendants.

Punitive or exemplary damages are allowed to the plaintiffs and may be awarded in the sound discretion of the jury in cases where the plaintiffs prove by clear and convincing evidence that the defendants consciously or deliberately engaged in wantonness with regard to the plaintiffs.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN

APJI 11.01 Damages- General

Wantonness is the conscious doing of some act or omission of some duty under knowledge of existing conditions and conscious that from the doing of such act or omission of such duty an injury will likely or probably result. Before a party can be said to be guilty of wanton conduct it must be shown that with reckless indifference to the consequences he either consciously and intentionally did some wrongful act or consciously omitted some known duty which produced the injury.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN

**APJI 29.00 Wantonness- Definition** 

The purpose of awarding compensatory damages is to fairly and reasonably compensate the injured party for the loss or injury sustained. Compensatory damages are intended as money compensation to the party wronged, to compensate him for his injury and other damages which have been inflicted upon him as a proximate result of the wrong complained of.

GIVEN REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
---------------	-----------

**APJI 11.02 Compensatory Damages** 

Page 17 of 23

The purpose of awarding punitive or exemplary damages is to allow money recovery to the plaintiffs by way of punishment to the defendants, and for the added purpose of protecting the public by deterring the defendants and others from doing such wrong in the future. The imposition of punitive damages is entirely discretionary with the jury. Should you award punitive damages, in fixing the amount, you must take into consideration the character and degree of the wrong as shown by the evidence in the case, and the necessity of preventing similar wrongs.

For a plaintiff to be entitled to recover punitive damages, the plaintiff must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant consciously or deliberately engaged in wantonness with regard to the plaintiff.

Clear and convincing evidence means evidence that, when weighed against evidence in opposition, will produce in the mind of the trier of fact a firm conviction as to each essential element of the claim and a high probability as to the correctness of the conclusion. Proof by clear and convincing evidence requires a level of proof greater than a preponderance of the evidence or the substantial weight of the evidence, but less than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Wantonness means conduct which is carried on with a reckless or conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
O1 1 D1 1	TELL COLD	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

**APJI 11.03 Punitive Damages** 

The p	laintiffs claim c	ompensation	for the fo	ollowing iter	ns or el	ements
of damages:	medical expens	ses, loss of ea	rnings, pl	hysical pain	and su	ffering,
disfigureme	nt, mental angui	sh, and loss o	f consorti	ium.		

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
-------	---------	-----------

**APJI 11.04 Personal Injury- Elements** 

The law has no fixed monetary standard to compensate for physical pain and mental anguish. This element of damage is left to your good sound judgment and discretion as to what amount would reasonably and fairly compensate the plaintiffs for such physical pain and mental anguish as you find from the evidence the plaintiffs did suffer.

If you are reasonably satisfied from the evidence that the plaintiffs have undergone pain and suffering or mental anguish as a proximate result of the injury in question, you should award a sum which will reasonably and fairly compensate them for such pain, suffering, or mental anguish suffered by them.

GIVENI	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
--------	---------	-----------

APJI 11.05 Personal Injury- Physical Pain and Mental Anguish

The measure of damages for medical expenses is all reasonable
expenses necessarily incurred for doctors' and medical bills which the
plaintiffs have paid or become obligated to pay. The reasonableness of, and
the necessity for, such expenses are matters for your determination from the
evidence.

**APJI 11.09 Personal Injury- Medical Expenses** 

It is for you to determine from the evidence the nature, extent and duration of the plaintiff's injuries. If you are reasonably satisfied from the evidence that the plaintiff has suffered disfigurement, and that such injuries proximately resulted from the wrongs complained of, then you should include in your verdict such sum as you determine to be reasonable compensation for such injuries.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
OI VIDIN	KELOSED	

**APJI 11.06 Permanent Injuries or Disfigurement** 

In determining the amount of damages for loss of earnings, you
should consider any evidence of the plaintiff's earning capacity, his earnings,
the manner in which he ordinarily occupied his time before the injury, his
inability to pursue his occupation, and determine what he was reasonably
certain to have earned during the time so lost, had he not been disabled.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN
	KELOSED	

**APJI 11.10 Loss of Earnings** 

If you find for the plaintiffs, you may also determine the amount of money that will reasonably compensate Connie Ruhnow for any damages sustained by loss of her husband's consortium and services. Consortium includes love, companionship, affection, society, comfort, solace, support, sexual relations and services. You may take into consideration the length of time of such loss.

GIVEN	REFUSED	WITHDRAWN	

APJI 11.13-A Consortium and Services- Husband